

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action that was mailed on August 5, 2003. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indicated allowability of claim 3. New claim 11 is based upon original claim 1, but is limited to the specific nitrogen-containing curing agents disclosed on pages 13-15 of the specification. New claim 12 is based upon original claim 5. New claim 13 is based upon original claim 6. No new matter is introduced by this Amendment. Claims 1-13 are in the application.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-10 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,190,787 (Maeda) in view of JP 10-324791 (Shiobara). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner argues that the comparative experimental data presently of record is insufficiently quantitative to distinguish the presently claimed invention over the prior art. Applicants conducted testing as follows: A sample was ignited for 10 seconds. Then the time t1 in seconds until the flame disappeared was measured for the sample. The same sample was re-ignited for 10 seconds and then the time t2 in seconds until the flame disappeared was measured. The rating "burned" indicates that the sample was completely burned in the first ignition (t1 is about 60 to 80 seconds) and the second test (t2) could not be conducted. The total burning time (t1 + t2) of V-0 is about 1/10 that of the rating "burned" (t1 only). This can be seen from the data which follows:

<i>EXAMPLE 1</i>	Burning Times (in seconds)					total
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Sample 5	
t1	2	0	1	0	1	26
t2	6	4	5	2	5	
total	8	4	6	2	6	

<i>EXAMPLE 2</i> Burning Times (in seconds)						
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Sample 5	total
t1	2	1	1	1	1	
t2	3	3	2	2	4	
total	5	4	3	3	5	20

<i>EXAMPLE 3</i> Burning Times (in seconds)						
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Sample 5	total
t1	0	0	1	0	0	
t2	0	2	3	2	1	
total	0	2	4	2	1	9

<i>EXAMPLE 4</i> Burning Times (in seconds)						
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Sample 5	total
t1	0	1	0	0	1	
t2	1	1	0	2	2	
total	1	2	0	2	3	8

<i>EXAMPLE 5</i> Burning Times (in seconds)						
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Sample 5	total
t1	2	0	1	1	0	
t2	3	2	2	2	3	
total	5	2	3	3	3	16

<i>COMPARATIVE EXAMPLE 1</i> Burning Times (in seconds)						
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Sample 5	total
t1	65	70	68	59	67	
t2	-	-	-	-	-	
total	65	70	68	59	67	329

<i>COMPARATIVE EXAMPLE 2</i> Burning Times (in seconds)						
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Sample 5	total
t1	2	1	2	1	2	
t2	5	3	2	3	5	
total	7	4	4	4	7	26

<i>COMPARATIVE EXAMPLE 3</i> Burning Times (in seconds)						
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Sample 5	total
t1	2	2	1	2	1	
t2	5	3	5	6	5	
total	7	5	6	8	6	32

<i>COMPARISON 1 (in Declaration)</i> Burning Times (in seconds)						
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Sample 5	total
t1	55	68	75	70	58	
t2	-	-	-	-	-	
total	55	68	75	70	58	326

<i>COMPARISON 2 (in Declaration)</i> Burning Times (in seconds)						
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Sample 5	total
t1	66	78	69	63	61	
t2	-	-	-	-	-	
total	66	78	69	63	61	337

If the Examiner believes that it would make any difference, Applicants are willing to re-present this data in the form of a Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132.

New claims 11-13 recite a nitrogen-containing phenolic resin that has as its nitrogen-containing moiety either either a triazine ring bearing a phenyl substituent and two amino nitrogen substituents (Formula 7) or a triazine ring bearing three amino nitrogen substituents (Formula 8) or a triazine ring bearing three phenol substituents (Formula 9). In contrast, Shiobara appears to disclose only a phenolic resin that has as its nitrogen-containing moiety a triazine ring bearing two amino substituents. Therefore, even assuming one of ordinary skill in the art were motivated to modify the Maeda disclosure to include the Shiobara phenolic resin, one would still not have the invention of claims 11-13 herein.

Should there be any questions, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Richard Gallagher (Reg. No. 28,781) at (703) 205-8008.

Application Number 09/883,276
Attorney Docket Number 0171-0759P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By



Andrew D. Meikle, #32,868

ADM/RG



P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000